DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 482 123 HE 036 393

AUTHOR	Creamer, Elizabeth G.
TITLE	Policies That Part: Early Career Experiences of Co-Working Academic Couples.
PUB DATE	2003-11-00
NOTE	35p.; Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Portland, OR, November 13-16, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Careers; *College Faculty; Dual Career Family; Higher Education; Incentives; *Marriage; *Tenure

ABSTRACT

This study examined the early career experiences of nine co-working academic couples who entered faculty careers in the mid 1970s and 1980s. Their retrospective accounts provide information about their initial attraction, the compacts they made during the decision to marry or enter into a long-term relationship, and how they negotiated the academic reward structure prior to tenure. Couples used a number of different strategies to establish their intellectual autonomy, including downplaying their personal relationship and their collaboration. Promotion and tenure polices are one of many work-life policies that communicate a family-friendly or couple-friendly culture. (Contains 5 tables and 24 references.) (Author/SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 482 123

Policies that Part: Early Career Experiences of Co-Working Academic Couples

Elizabeth G. Creamer

Associate Professor

Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

311 E. Eggleston

Virginia Tech

Blacksburg, VA 24061-0301

creamere@vt.edu

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the early career experiences of nine co-working academic couples that entered faculty careers in the mid 1970s and 1980s. Their retrospective accounts provide information about their initial attraction, the compacts they made during the decision to marry or enter into a long-term relationship, and how they negotiated the academic reward structure prior to tenure. Couples used a number of different strategies to establish their intellectual autonomy, including to downplay their personal relationship and their collaboration. Promotion and tenure policies are one of many work-life policies that communicate a family-friendly or couple-friendly culture.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Creamer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE036393

Draft manuscript prepared for the ASHE 2003 Symposium, G11, *Decision Seasons: Important Faculty Choices about Work and Life.*

Policies that Part: Early Career Experiences of Co-Working Academic Couples

It is the habit of Western thought to envision creativity as arising from individual insight. "Creativity begins in a single mind," Fox and Faver wrote in 1984. This ideological assumption is reflected in the emphasis placed on individual accomplishments in the traditional academic reward structure. Social constructionists, such as Vera John-Steiner (1997, 2000), see knowledge production in an entirely different way. From this theoretical perspective, knowledge is constructed through dialogue and shaped by powerful contextual forces, including intellectual perspectives of the day and other dynamics of the environment and personal relationships. This perspective considers collaboration as central to knowledge production and research productivity.

The individualistic values embedded in the traditional academic reward structure offer one explanation for why early career faculty experience a lack of community and sense of isolation (Trower, Austin, & Sorcinelli, 2001). "Scholars in their early years on the job reported experiencing loneliness, isolation, competition, and sometimes incivility," Trower, Austin, and Sorcinelli observed (p. 5). Given this context and that they have yet to develop collegial networks that may help sustain them in mid- and late career, it is not surprising that early

career faculty may partner with someone they trust as they try to establish themselves in the profession and learn the ropes of teaching and research.

While only recently emerging as the subject of research by scholars in the field of higher education, dual career academic couples have had sizable presence on most campuses for decades (Loeb, 2001). Thirty-five percent of male academics and 40% of female academics are reported to have a spouse or partner who is also employed in higher education (Astin & Milem, 1997).

There is evidence that scholarly collaboration among academic couples is not unusual. In a survey I conducted in 1997 of a matched sample of male and female faculty members at Research 1 universities across the United States, 60% of the married respondents reported that they exchanged feedback with a spouse about draft manuscripts and 30% reported that they had appeared as co-authors on scholarly publications (Creamer, 2001, Appendix B). That the majority of respondents had exchanged feedback about manuscripts, points to the invisible or unacknowledged labor supplied by a spouse or partner that has an indirect impact on productivity. The contribution of an invisible partner to scientific creativity has been documented by a number of authors using literary and historical methods (Perry & Brownley, 1984; Rose, 1994). Co-authorship, on the other hand, has a direct impact on research productivity. It is a way that collaborators acknowledge a conceptual contribution to research.

Academics make a number of decisions at early career that have the potential to shape their future career trajectory. This paper examines the

early career experiences of nine co-working academic couples[1]. It uses the retrospective accounts provided by co-working couples to describe the work and intellectual foundation of their initial attraction, the compacts they made during the decision to marry or enter into a long-term relationship, and how they responded to the injunctions of academic reward structure. The accommodations couples made to the demands of the academic reward structure illustrate the central thesis of this paper. That is that how institutions interpret and implement promotion and tenure policies is one of many reflections of a couple-friendly and family-friendly culture.

Related Literature

There is surprisingly little research about dual career academic couples in the literature in higher education. What there is tends to focus primarily on work-life policies with the assumption that they accommodate the responsibilities of family life without the concomitant assumption that they also impact work accomplishments. For research on dual career academic couples, we have to turn to the literature in sociology (e.g. Hochschild, 1997; Risman, 1998; Schwartz, 1994) and family studies (e.g. Steil, 1997) where academic couples figure prominently in studies about egalitarian family forms. These maintain the

---

[1] Even though I have no same-sex pairs in my sample, I use the words, couple and partners interchangeably as way to avoid marginalizing the experience of

focus on home and family life by defining egalitarianism, not in terms of the priority of work as Scanzoni and Scanzoni (1976) proposed, but in terms of the division of labor on household matters. I have argued elsewhere that another way to frame the discussion about work-life issues is by examining how they impact the ability of faculty to accomplish their work (Creamer, 2001).

The impact of an academic partner on publishing productivity is documented by a cross-sectional analyses of four national databases of postsecondary faculty produced between 1969 and 1993 conducted by Xie and Shauman (1998). Their major conclusion was that men and women benefit *equally* from the human capital of a highly educated spouse. Marriage is a "personal asset," (p. 859), they argued. In a curiously one-sided statement given their argument of an equal benefit, Xie and Shauman concluded that the prime benefit of marriage to women faculty is not relief from domestic responsibilities, but from the "high human capital of their spouses, who tend to be highly educated professionals" (p. 860).

The failure to find significant differences between men's and women's research productivity when structural factors are controlled, such as institutional location and position (Xie & Shuaman, 1998), has led to the speculation that egalitarian family forms explains how women can continue to carry the majority of household responsibility and still manage to maintain comparable levels of productivity. Arlie Hochschild, the author of the *Time Bind* (1997), labeled

---

same-sex couples.

egalitarianism as a "contingent" phenomena, inspired not by an ideological commitment, but by the work-driven demands of dual career families. She wrote, rather acerbically,

> This study demonstrates that these lifestyle "pioneers" did nothing of the sort; they reconstructed new family forms not because they desired to blaze new social trails but because the constraints of work and the value placed on success altered the practice of their daily lives. (p. 197)

The intense and focused commitment of time required to meet the expectations for tenure at most universities is an example of how the requirements of work shape the daily lives and lifestyles of academics during early career.

While it is the most common form of cross-sex collaboration (Kaufman, 1978), the risks of collaborating with a spouse have particularly strong implications for the career success of women. Women generally receive less recognition when they publish with men (Loeb, 2001). This is even more so the case for women collaborating with a spouse (Rossiter, 1993). Part of the explanation for this lays in a phenomenon, labeled by R. K. Merton as the Matthew Effect, where well-known scholars receive considerably more credit than they often deserve for work done with others and "sometimes even for work for which they were not responsible at all" (Loeb, p. 171). This is one reason why early-career faculty members are encouraged to cut formal ties with a mentor and to establish an independent identity before collaborating. This

offers an explanation for women most often chose to collaborate with other women where issues of credit and recognition are less likely to be clouded by differences in status.

Methodology

Sample

The interview sample contains nine academic couples that have co-authored research publications. I interviewed both members of each couple in all but one case (N=17). Each pair includes at least one member who holds the ranks of associate or full professor at a research university and has published a career total of a minimum of 21 refereed journal articles and/or book chapters.

Descriptive information derived from the curriculum vitae each participant supplied, appears in Table 1. This includes the year and discipline of the their PHD, year of first permanent full-time faculty appointment, total number of publications the year prior to tenure and being promoted, and number of publications co-authored with their spouse at these key junctions.

Insert Table 1 About Here

At senior ranks at the time I interviewed them in 1997 or 1998, the academic couples are almost equally divided between those entering faculty careers in the early to mid 1970s and the early to mid 1980s. All but one held

comparable, tenure track faculty lines. While largely in the social sciences, participants had background in a variety of academic disciplines including geology, geography, sociology, psychology, special education, anthropology, and communication studies. They are all located in different research universities. Four of nine couples have children. All but two of the couples can be described as career-equal or career symmetrical and four have records that show such strong symmetry that it cannot be coincidental. Significant differences in career age or stage only characterize two relationships.

Data Collection

Multiple sources of data were collected for each of the nine collaborative pairs. These include: (a) a one-on-one interview with one or both members of the pair, (b) a copy of their vita which I used to assess publication levels, and (b) document analysis of selected co-authored publications when they could inform the interview and/or analysis.

The interview. After collecting background material, including a copy of a curriculum vita and a signed informed consent form, I used a semi-structured protocol as a guide for the interview. The protocol contained questions relating to the dynamics and outcomes of a specific collaborative relationship. I tried to create a climate for a rather free-flowing conversation, so I did not necessarily ask the interview questions in the exact same order or way but at a time where they seemed to fit in the flow of the conversation. Interviews normally lasted

between 45 and 90 minutes. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). The process began with open coding, expanded to clarification of the definition of codes and elimination of codes that did not prove significant across cases, moved to axial coding that identified connections between categories, and ended with a set of theoretical propositions. Data collection, analysis, and verification occurred simultaneously, utilizing an iterative process. Given the complexity of data, interviews were read and coded many times over a number of years until I developed a satisfactory coding scheme and method of analysis.

Trustworthiness. I used a number of strategies to enhance the trustworthiness of the findings. These included (a) triangulation by using multiple sources of data, (b) thick description, and (c) member checks. Interviews with a second member of a pair afforded the opportunity to test the accuracy of my interpretations and to follow-up on responses from the initial interview that seemed unclear or contradictory.

Findings

Academics face a number of decisions at early career that have the potential to have long-term significance not only for their career trajectory but also for their personal relationship. These include the decision to enter in a committed relationship, the type of job to accept, and the strategies to employ to meet the demands for career advancement. These decisions are even thornier for academic couples during early career, particularly those with overlapping areas of expertise, as they face an even more restricted labor market than do their peers who are unmarried or married to someone in a different field.

Academic couples offered a number of ways their decision to marry or to enter into a long-term relationship was shaped by their career aspirations.

The Attraction

The explanations co-working couples offered for the decision to enter in a committed relationship and to collaborate were often intertwined. Probably because most met during graduate school when their vocational identities had been established, these relationships were shaped by a career focus, shared interests, and expectations about the lifestyle demanded by an academic career. Collaboration offered these couples a way to maintain both a personal relationship and a way to achieve career goals.

Early vocational identity is evident in how the member of one couple, Anna[2], described the decision to marry in 1974. Characterizing herself and her spouse, Roger, as being "terminally tongue tied" about talking about their personal relationship, Anna made it clear that their career ambitions came first in their relationship.

> There was no question about one of us giving up on our careers. We were too committed to our work to consider that. The relationship could have gone either way. (Anna, Endowed Professor, Psychology)

When Anna said that the relationship "could have gone either way" she meant that the decision to continue their relationship and marry only came after they were both able to secure suitable faculty positions.

The strong role of career interests in the decision to marry is also evident in the account of Opal and Cliff, who first met in the early 1970s when she was a doctoral student and he, her professor. Characterizing herself as a person who developed a compulsive and competitive orientation toward through her involvement with debate in high school, Opal said

> I wonder if in part you have some people who were naturally, compulsively motivated to produce in the first place and, so

---

[2] Full-length case studies of three couples mentioned in this paper; Martha and Greg, Anna and Roger, and Laura and Allen, appear in my book, *Working Equal:*

> perhaps, my finding a mate who also had the same tendencies, it made it easier for them to keep doing that because they had a mate who wasn't constantly after them to stop. (Opal, Professor, Communication Studies)

Opal is suggesting that part of what attracted her to her husband was that he would not get in the way of her strong work orientation.

Given the priority of work in the lives of these co-working couples, it is not surprising that an opportunity to talk about shared interests and to pursue ideas was central not only to the attraction that launched these relationships, but also to sustaining them. Self-labeled as a human geographer, Martha, talked about her initial attraction to her partner, Greg, in terms of a shared interest in the "life of the mind." Describing this, she said

> Both of us are driven by ideas. Both of us are very content, and have been all of our lives, with the excitement of the life of the mind. It makes us very compatible because it is something that we can really understand about each other. Many other people do not understand it very much…It's a philosophy about what life is about. (Martha, Professor, Geography)

Martha spent the first part of her career with another male partner who shared her intellectual interests. In finding a mate to collaborate with,

Martha is living out a fantasy that merges a private and public life. Even as a teenager, she imagined herself sitting down at the breakfast table with a partner and having an animated conversation about work.

For some couples, the experience of co-authoring brings out the qualities that brought them to admire and respect their partner's skills and intellect in the first place. Thirty years after their relationship began, Aleesha, now a prominent feminist sociologist, said that they have always had the habit of reading and commenting on each other's work. She said she enjoys writing with her partner because

> It makes me like him because when we sit down to work on something together, I see the side of him that I like and admire a lot and that I liked and admired when I first met him. It taps into this part. I am impressed by the things that he knows that I don't know. (Aleesha, Professor, Sociology)

Deeply shared intellectual interests are at the roots of these relationships. Whether informally through feedback about manuscripts or acknowledged formally through co-authorship on publications, collaboration offered these couples a way to progress toward their career goals while sustaining a personal life. They accomplished their career goals not in the traditional way by keeping a distinction between their personal and private lives, but in the nontraditional way of merging their private and public lives through scholarly collaboration. It is my

argument that these relationships did not drive research productivity as much as it made it possible to unfold.

The Compact

The couples in my sample looked back on the early days of their relationship and point to an agreement that was implicitly or explicitly negotiated about the priority of their careers. One aspect of the agreement was that work was central to their identities and lives. A second aspect was an agreement to keep it equal, generally by taking turns in accepting opportunities, with the intent of advancing both careers. The centrality of work, not the household, is what is important about this agreement. The decision to co-author was often a natural outgrowth of shared interests and the commitment to support each other's careers and to "keep it equal."

For some couples, a vow to "keep it equal" was part of the initial commitment they made to each other. Ideology was at the root of some of these commitments; pragmatic reasons drove others. Laura, an anthropologist who co-authored a book with her husband that appeared in print just about the time she was being reviewed for tenure, described the ideological basis of their relationship in the early 1980s. She said, "A deep philosophical commitment to egalitarianism marked the beginning of our relationship." Another couple's commitment to "keep it equal" was less ideological and more pragmatic. Roxanne, member of pair of psychologists, acknowledged that she and her

husband, Stuart, set out to maintain comparable records so that neither one of them would be seen as the trailing partner.

> There was an element of competition. Also in that we knew that if we wanted to move on in our careers, we were going to have to stay close to each other in terms of our level of visibility and productivity. We didn't want to have the feeling of one person tagging along after the other. (Roxanne, Professor, Psychology)

For some, the goal of awarding equal priority to both careers meant the couple adopted that strategy that they would take turns taking advantage of opportunities that came their way. A pair of geologists, Sally and Ed, who married in the late 1960s, Sally described the compact they reached:

> That had been our agreement from the very beginning. Before we were married, before we even got engaged, we sat down and talked. How are we going to do this if we get married? Should we just live in sin or just split and go our own ways or what? We decided we wanted to stay together more than anything and if we would stay together it would mean somebody would have to sacrifice; that we would take turns sacrificing. The relationship started as co-equal from the beginning. (Sally, Professor, Geology)

She now a full professor and he a lecturer, Sally and Ed have never held comparable positions. In the context of a very tight job market, they

approached their relationship with the assumption that in order to keep their careers balanced they would have to take turns sacrificing.

The compact these co-working couples made and the strategies they employed to promote their own and each other's careers met with varying degrees of success during early career. My interpretation of the retrospective accounts supplied by my informants suggest that their early commitment to mutuality often came in conflict with the value of individualism that is deeply embedded in the traditional reward and recognition systems of research universities.

The Compact Meets Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

Co-working couples reported that they received a variety of warnings from colleagues and department heads about the risks of associated with collaborating with someone with whom they shared an intimate relationship. The message underlying these exchanges was often confusion about "who did what" and how to award credit. Some women encountered the implicit or explicit charge that the male member of the pair must be doing the work.

One of the most consistent themes to emerge across the collaborative accounts was the experience of being admonished about the importance of an independent research identity. Some couples appeared to be aware of this power of this injunction from the earliest days of their faculty careers. For example, Roger, a member of a couple hired in the

same psychology department at the same time, said "We were sensitive of that from the beginning and knew we needed to establish beyond a shadow of a doubt that each of us had an independent line of research that we were identified with." Participant seemed to feel this even more acutely when there was a career gap, even when the gap was as little as two years. A member of another pair of psychologists working in the same department, Roxanne, said "For me, personally, it was critical that I establish an area of independent of him because he was a couple of years further along."

Members of other co-working couples that collaborated prior to earning tenure, later chose to re-direct their research agenda in order to combat some of the questions they faced about intellectual autonomy. This was the case for a sociologist, Aleesha. Despite the fact that it quickly became apparent that her productivity would far outpace his, Aleesha chose to move away from the topic of dissertation, which was in area of interest she shared with her husband, Virgil. Of her decision to redirect her research agenda, Aleesha said:

> I think that one of the reasons I moved away from [the topic of her dissertation], in fact which is what I did my early work in, was because I wanted to be in a different domain. I didn't want to be [hesitation] … not just for practical reasons, such as that people might not give me credit for my work, but just because think the

> differentiation was … I didn't want to be the clone or little sister of this person who was already well established. I am a competitive person, much more than he is. I think that it was partly that as well. (Aleesha, Professor, Sociology)

Despite the investment in time it took to develop expertise in another topic, Aleesha responded to pressure to distinguish herself from her husband, not only to get credit for her work, but also in order to advance in her career, by redirecting her research agenda.

Co-working couples described numerous ways that their intellectual autonomy was challenged. The message underlying these exchanges was often confusion about "who did what" or how to award credit. Couples in the same department seemed particularly susceptible to these questions. "There is some perception on some people's part that you don't publish with your spouse because then you can't tell who really did the work" Alex, a member of a pair of special educators observed. Other couples were sensitive to the implication that one was carrying the other because there was really only enough work there for one. Melanie, Alex's partner, described what she considered to be mixed messages about collaborating.

> I felt like at some times we were being given mixed messages because we were told that it was better to collaborate than to write individually, and at other times we were told you need to write

> individually also. At this point, within our department and coming from the college level, we were actually asked to, by work, identify what our role had been in the effort ... I think they thought one of us was carrying the other. (Melanie, Associate Professor, Special Education)

Several women encountered the implicit or explicit charge that the male member of the pair was the one really doing the work. A sociologist, Samantha, stressed the pressure she and her husband felt to have distinct career trajectories after entering comparable faculty positions in the early 1970s. "Because we felt at that point in history women were very disadvantaged and it would be very easy to be seen as in your husband's shadow." Those who escaped these questions about their intellectual autonomy were those whose spouse was not an academic or in an area so far removed that even the most uniformed outsider could discern the individual contributions.

Even faculty whose record of awards during their early career clearly marked them as a super-star in the making, faced challenges about their intellectual autonomy. Although she downplayed it by labeling it as only a "small chunk of the total picture," Opal, now a professor in communication studies, has the astonishing record of publishing 4 of10 books, 6 of 26 chapters, and 33 of 112 journal articles with her spouse,

Cliff. When I asked her if she had encountered situations were people made assumptions about their co-authored work, she said

> Absolutely. In fact, after I had [won] about the third or fourth top paper award, there was one person who said, this can't be … what's the probability of that happening … it must be because of my connections with my spouse. Of course, these are papers that are read blind, but here's this person insinuating that somehow my achievements weren't due to my own efforts. (Opal, Professor, Communication Studies)

Opal's astonishing independent publication probably over-shadowed questions about the record she amassed with her husband.

Accommodations to the Expectations for Tenure

Prior to earning tenure, couples used a number of different strategies to respond to the questions about their intellectual autonomy. This included to conceal their relationship, downplay the amount they collaborated, maintain unusually symmetrical records, or to develop such a strong publication record that the collaboration was no longer an issue. After earning tenure and developing a publication record sufficient to have the intellectual capital to relocate, several couples relocated to more prestigious institutions. Others avoided the issue entirely by postponing formal collaboration until after earning the security of tenure.

Sally and Ed, two geologists, and Anna and Roger, two psychologists, are both couples who have sustained common research interests for decades. They are also similar in that they both not only completed degrees from the same department, but under the supervision of the same advisor. Entering tight job markets at different times, both concealed their relationship during the job interview process. Sally, now a professor at a midwestern university, said: "In 1983, you didn't have a spouse. You could live in sin, but you couldn't have a spouse." Anna and Roger, who secured comparable positions at another research university in the Midwest in the mid 1970s, also concealed their relationship during the interview process. Explaining that decision, Roger said, "It was a deliberate decision on my part. It is not that we lied about it; it is just that we chose to keep quiet about it. The reason I decided that was because the year before, a woman in the department had tried to get her spouse hired and it complicated things. It seemed to me certainly it was not going to do any good and it had the potential to do some harm."

Anna's and Roger's attempt to be strategic during the interview process, extended to early career. While always engaged in giving each other feedback about manuscripts, they sidestepped issues that might cloud recognition by not listing themselves as co-authors on any publications prior to earning tenure. Rogers words reflect how attuned they were about the injunction against collaboration

> We did some collaboration fairly early, but it is also true that we worked hard at establishing our own separate careers… The hazards in the department that we were in and a lot of departments like that is that any long-term collaborative relationship, the question arises, well whose is this really? There's this belief there is only enough there for one. It is particularly a hazard if you have a long-term collaboration with your advisor and a long-term collaboration with a spouse just draws those inferences. So, we were sensitive of that from the beginning and knew that we needed to establish beyond a shadow of doubt that each of us had an independent line of research that we were identified with. We did collaborate within the first few years of being faculty members but it was only on then third lines of research that weren't within either of our individual areas. (Roger, Professor, Psychology)

Despite Roger's references to collaborating within the first few years of being faculty members, neither Roger nor Anna's curriculum vitae show any publications that they co-authored prior to year they earned tenure (see Table 1). I did not have an opportunity to ask them about this apparent contradiction, but it seems likely that, like their decision to conceal their relationship during their job interviews, that they sought to avoid complications by not appearing as co-authors on any publications prior to earning tenure.

Another couples' publication records also raise the suspicion that they under-reported the amount they collaborated (see Table 1). The meteoric rise in Opal's total publication count and co-authored publication count in the four short years between tenure (1980, 3 of 15 co-authored with spouse) and achieving full professor (1984, 22 of 61 co-authored with spouse) raises some questions. Some considerable under-reporting of the amount she collaborated with her spouse in the early years is one possible explanation.

Some couples were able to counter the criticism their collaboration generated by developing such strong publication records that the collaboration became a mute issues. This was the case, for example, for Alex, a special educator, who came up to tenure with a total of 31 publications, 14 co-authored with his wife, Melanie (see Table 1). Resistant to the admonition he received from his department head to reduce how much he collaborated, Alex admitted "I did it my way and because I did enough of it, you know, I dazzled them my numbers a little bit, so to speak. So I got by with it." Similarly, Roxanne, a psychologists married to Stuart, said that their publications were of such strength and quality that

> By the time we got tenure there, we both had pretty substantial vitas and so you can begin to say well, but you have all of these overlapping publications. But at least in our case, the schools were smart enough to realize that as long as we continued to be

productive, whether it was jointly or singly, it didn't matter. (Roxanne, Professor, Psychology)

In this case, the institutional context was such that their collaboration was not devalued.

A strong publication record seemed to have provided some women the leverage to relocate to other universities that they perceived to be more couple-friendly. Anna, one of two cognitive psychologists mentioned previously, accepted an invitation to apply for a faculty position an endowed chair at a university in the Midwest on the condition that a position was available for her partner, Roger. Anna and Roger negotiated appointments in different departments as a strategy to avoid some of the departmental politics their relationship engendered at their previous institution. Similarly, Roxanne and Stuart, another pair of psychologists, escaped departmental politics after earning tenure by relocating to a more prestigious institution. Like Anna, the move was made at Roxanne's initiation, in response to a vacancy for a senior woman. She said she found this ironic, because

> It has turned out that the career moves we have made have really been at my instigation, which is kind of ironic because I think that if you just put down objective indicators, he has the better record of the two of us in terms of publications. (Roxanne, Professor, Psychology)

Roxanne's statement is a bit perplexing given that she and her husband, Stuart, have been able to hold true to their original pledge to keep it equal and maintained records over the first ten years of their careers that are remarkable for their symmetry l (see Table 1).

Summary

Fortunately for the well being of these work-driven relationships, the influence on the reward and recognition system on the personal relationship diminished after the intense period during early career that marks the bid for tenure. By that point, the injunction against collaboration diminished and, at the same time, most couples had clearly differentiated their research agendas. Anna noted the shift in priorities in the reward structure when she said, "We're both full professors now... All of the issues that were important at the beginning of us keeping separate identities are no longer important. We both have very separate identities as professionals and, for the most part, aside from the most general kinds of conferences, we don't even go to the same meetings."

The couples listed in the Table 1 are success stories. With the exception of Melanie whose publication rates slowed markedly after tenure, all the faculty members in my sample were promoted and continued as active researchers. Despite vivid accounts of encounters with colleagues questioning their intellectual autonomy, all of the faculty members in tenure track positions were tenured and most promoted. As

judged by the awards and honors listed on their vitae, many have achieved considerable prominence in their field. It is likely that there are a comparable number of faculty members who did not volunteer for an interview whose collaboration derailed not only their bid for tenure but also their personal relationship.

Shifting an established line of research is no minor decision for scientists who often devote a career to a single-minded pursuit of a research agenda. It requires a significant investment of human capital to retool and develop expertise in a new area. That it was invariably the woman who repeatedly referred to the importance establishing an identity distinct from their spouse during the early part of their careers, suggests that issues of intellectual autonomy continue to present greater challenges to women who collaborate with a spouse than it does for men in the same situation, just as it has been documented to have done in the past (e.g. Kauffman, 1978; Russ, 1983). While both members of such couples may mutually benefit in the long run from the human capital of their partner, as suggested by Xie and Shauman (1998), this is not necessarily a benefit that manifests itself in the same way.

Conclusions

If spousal hiring polices keep academic couples together, as some authors have suggested (Wolf-Wendel, Twombly, & Rice, 2000), then the accounts presented her suggest that promotion and tenure policies are

equally likely to pull them apart. Issues of recognition and reward had a profound influence on shaping the early career experiences of the sample of dual career academics in this study, often appearing to challenge their commitment to promote each other's career ambitions and to "keep it equal." A partner in the same occupation, particularly when faculty appointments are in the same department, probably exacerbates the requirement to establish an independent scholarly identity that is such a major career hurdle for early career faculty.

The power of the reward structure to shape behavior and impact personal relationships is evident in the range of evasive strategies couples deployed in response to the injunction against collaborating, including to conceal or downplay their relationship, maintain symmetrical publication records, and to re-align a research agenda to avoid suspicion about their intellectual autonomy. That acrimonious departmental politics led some couples to relocate in search of a more couple-friendly environment, are further indications of the power the reward structure and peer censure to shape behavior. Indications that some partners may understate the amount they collaborate attests that the reward structure is less likely to question the unrecognized contribution of invisible labor, than it is with pairs or teams trying to frame their contributions in ways that reflect equality.

Obstruction of the ability to document contribution and, consequently, credit is often put forward as a reason for the devaluation of formal collaboration, as signified by the claim of made by co-authorship. One way authors can address this concern is to be meticulous and detailed about documenting the role of each author to the intellectual substance of a publication in the method sections of research publications. This is particularly critical when more than one author is involved in analyzing and interpreting the data analysis. This kind of documentation will not only facilitate individual reward and recognition, but also add insight about how teams or pairs of researchers accomplish the interpretive and analytic process (Wasser & Bresler, 1996).

Conventions for the order of listing authors are most applicable when the work relationship is hierarchical and one person is rightfully due the credit for the conceptual framework. A number of feminists have written about how confining traditional authorship conventions are in expressing multiple voices and representing authors who have made equal intellectual contributions (see, for example, Gottlieb, 1995; Richardson, L., 1995). Some authors have gone to creative lengths to attempt to demonstrate equality in the way they represent names at the front of a paper, such as by scrambling first and last names (e.g. Kochan, Mullen, Mullen, & Kachon, 2001). As style conventions have been revised to require the use of active voice and first person, it is time to make room

for more than one authorial voice in academic publications. Doing this would not only create an avenue to formally acknowledge the social nature of most knowledge production, but also to present conflicting viewpoints that often serve as the nexus for new insight (Creamer, 2003).

Other than basic, descriptive research about the presence and use of work-life policies, there has been very little research about academic couples in the higher education literature. Xie's and Shauman's (1998) carefully documented conclusion that men and women scientists benefit *equally* from the human capital of a highly educated spouse, invites a wide range of research about the impact of an academic spouse on productivity, including about how the impact varies among couples are in comparable and non-comparable positions. Using a CV to compare the publication records of co-working couples at key junctures in an academic life, as I have done in Table 1, offers a way to imagine how the intellectual lives of some academic couples may be intertwined in ways we have yet to imagine.

References

Astin, H. S., & Milem, J. F. (1997). The status of academic couples in U.S. institutions.: In M. A. Ferber and J. W. Loeb (Eds), Academic couples: Problems and promises (pp. 128-155). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Creamer, E. G. & Associates. (2001). *Working equal: Academic couples as collaborators.* NY: Routledge Falmer Press.

Creamer, E. G. (in press, Fall 2003). Collaborators' attitudes about differences of opinion. *Journal of Higher Education.*

Fox, M. F., & Faver, C. A. (1984). Independence and cooperation in research: The motivations and costs of collaboration. *Journal of Higher Education, 55*(3), 347-359.

Gottlieb, A. (1995). Beyond the lonely anthropologist: Collaboration in research and writing. *American Anthropologist, 97*(1), 21=25.

Hochschild, A. R. (1997). *The time bind: When work becomes home and home becomes work.* NY: Henry Holt and Company.

John-Steiner, V. (1997). Notebooks of the mind: Explorations of thinking. N.Y.:Oxford University Press.

John-Steiner, V. (2000). Creative collaboration. N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

Kaufman, D. R. (1978). Associational ties in academe: Some male and female differences. *Sex Roles, 4(1),* 9-21.

Kochan, F. K., Mullen, & C. A., Mullen, C. A., Kochan, F. K. (2001). Collaborative authorship: Reflections on a briar patch of twisted brambles. *Teachers College Record*, retrieved on-line.

Loeb, J. W. (2001). The role of recognition and reward in research productivity: Implications for partner collaboration. In E. G. Creamer and Associates, Working equal: Academic couples as collaborators (pp. 167-185). NY: RoutledgeFalmer Press.

Perry, R., & Brownley, M. W. (Eds.).(1984). Mothering the mind: Twelve studies of writers and their silent partners. NY: Holmes and Meier.

Richardson, L. (1995). Writing-stories: Co-authoring 'The Sea Monster:' a Writing story. *Qualitative Inquiry, 1*(2), 189-203.

Risman, B. J. (1998). Gender vertigo: American families in transition. New Haven, CT. Yale University Press.

Rose, P. *Parallel lives: Five Victorian Marriages*. N.Y.: Vintage Press.

Rossiter, M. W. (1993). The Matilda effect in science. *Social Studies of Science, 23(2),* 325-341.

Russ, J. (1983). *How to suppress women's writing*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Scanzoni, L., & Scanzoni, J. (1976). Men, women, and change: A sociology of marriage and family. N.Y.: McGraw Hill.

Steil, J. M. (1997). *Marital equality: Its relationship to well-being of husbands and wives*. Thousand Oaks, CA. SAGE Publications.

Schwartz, P. (1994). *Love between equals: How peer marriages really work*. NY: The Free Press.

Tower, C. A., Austin, A. E., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (May 2001). Paradise lost: How the academy converts enthusiastic recruits into early-career doubters. *AAHE Bulletin, 53*(9), pp. 3-6.

Wasser, J. D., & Bresler, L. (1996). Working in the interpretive zone: Conceptualizing collaboration in qualitative research teams. *Educational Researcher, 25* (5), 5-15.

Wolf-Wendel, L., Twombly, S., & Rice, S. (2000). Dual career couples: Keeping them together. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71,* 291-321.

Xie, Y., & Shauman, K. A. (1998). Sex differences in research productivity: New evidence about an old puzzle. *American Sociological Review, 63,* 847-870.

Table 1: Descriptive Characteristics of Couples Featured in the Paper, In Alphabetical Order by First Named

Couple/ Descriptor	PHD Year/ Discipline	First Faculty Job[3]/ Year and Title	Tenure Year, # Articles Co-with Spouse, Total Articles[4]	Year Promoted to Full, Position, # Articles Co-with Spouse, Total Articles, or 1997 Info
Anna Roger *By the Book*	1974-Psychology* 1974-Psychology	1974- Ass't Prof 1974-Ass't Prof	1981 - 0/9 1979 - 0/9	1990-Prof 6/36 1990-Prof 7/36
Aleesha Virgil *Satisfied with Trailing*	1973-Sociology 1971-Sociology	1973-Ass't Prof 1969-Ass't Prof	1983- 3/11 1974- 1/3	1983-Prof - 3/50 1985- Prof - 3/35
Laura Allen	1983- Anthropology 1976-MA, Creative Writing	1982-Ass't Prof 1985-Ass't Prof	1991 - 0/1 books; 0/13 articles 1991 -0/2 books; 1/17 short stories	1998-Prof - 1/6 books; 0/21 articles 1998-Prof - 1/5 books; 0/24
Martha Greg *Secure in Well Established Reputations*	1972-Geography* -Geography	1972-Ass't Prof Not available	1979-Assoc Prof 0/9 Not available	1990-Prof - 1/35 Not available
Melanie Alex *Taking a*	1983-Special Ed* 1985-Special Ed	1985- Visiting Faculty 1985-Ass't Prof	1993 - 15/19 1991 - 14/31	1997- Associate Prof - 16/22 1997-

[3] Does not include visiting or temporary appointments.

[4] For both promotion to associate and to full professor, publications reported are the total up until the year preceding. The total includes book chapters and refereed journal articles and excludes reprints and non-refereed publications.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Back Seat				Associate Prof - 15/45
Opal Cliff *Topping the Charts*	1974-Education Communications	1974-Ass't Prof Not available	1980- 3/15 Not available	1984-Prof- 22/61 Not available
Roxanne Stuart *Keeping it Equal*	1982-Psychology* 1982-Psychology	1984-Ass't Prof 1984-Research Coordinator	1990 - 7/15 1989 - 4/17	1993 - Prof, 30/56 1993 - Prof, 30/57
Sally Ed *Taking Turns Sacrificing*	1983-Geology* 1973-Geology	1983- Ass't Prof No official position	1989- Associate Prof 1/11 Lecturer	1997- 6/28; 1/6 books
Samantha Turner *Steady State*	1970-Sociology[5] 1971-Sociology	1970-Ass't Prof 1971-Ass't Prof	Not on CV Not on CV	1988 - Prof 0/1 book; 5/24 articles 1989-Prof- 0/1 book; 12/24 articles

[5] *=degree from same institution

ED 436 393

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Policies that Part: Early Career Experiences of Co-Working Academic Couples	
Author(s): Elizabeth Creamer	
Corporate Source: VA Tech	Publication Date: 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

X

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: EG Creamer	Printed Name/Position/Title: Elizabeth Creamer	
Organization/Address: VA Tech	Telephone: 540 231-8441	FAX: 540 231-7015
	E-Mail Address: ecreamer@vt.edu	Date: 11/14/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org